

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheet", which includes figures 3-4, replaces the original sheet including figures 3-4. It amends figure. 4 by adding the label 313 to the transistor shown in the figure and described in at least paragraph [0015] on page 6 of the specification

Attachment:

One (1) Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action mailed August 21, 2007, Applicant has amended the application as above. No new matter is added by the amendments as discussed below. Applicant respectfully requests the entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the remarks set forth below.

Discussion of Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 10 have been amended. Claim 11 is added. Upon the entry of the amendments, Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. The amendments to Claims 1 and 6 are supported by Figure 4. New Claim 11 is also supported by Figure 4. Thus, the amendments to the claims do not introduce any new matter.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Brocklin et al. (US 6,011,371). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 as amended are not anticipated by the Brocklin reference because the control system described therein does not include *each and every element* set forth in claims 1, 2, 6 and 7.

“For a prior art reference to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference.” *Diversitech Corp. v. Century Steps, Inc.*, 850 F.2d 675, 677, 7 USPQ 2d 1315, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The amended Claims 1 and 6 recite that the second resistor R_2 is grounded and the reference voltage signal is outputted from a connection point between the first resistor R_1 and the second resistor R_2 . See *figure 4*. Therefore, the voltage value at the connection point between the first resistor R_1 and the second resistor R_2 is different from the voltage value at the connection point between the first resistor R_1 and the thermistor R_{th} .

However, according to the Van Brocklin reference, one end of the resistor 70 is connected to the resistor 66 and the other end of the resistor 70 is connected to a capacitor 72. See *figure 2*. In other words, the resistor 70 is not directly grounded. Therefore, when the capacitor is fully charged, the voltage value at the connection point between the resistor 70 and the resistor 66 and the voltage value at the connection point between the resistor 50 and the thermistor 46 are the same.

Accordingly, Van Brocklin does not teach every element of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 6 are allowable over the prior art of record and respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1 and 6 be reconsidered and withdrawn. In addition, since claims 2 and 7 depend from claim 1 and 6, respectively, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of these claims should be withdrawn as well.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 5, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Brocklin et al. (US 6,011,371) in view of Dob et al. (US 4,734,012). In addition, claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Brocklin et al. (US 6,011,371) in view of Ohi (US

US 5,043,642). Claims 3~5 and 8~10 depend from the claim 1 and 6, respectively, and add further limitations thereto.

As stated above, claims 1 and 6 are different from and not anticipated by what Van Brocklin discloses. Moreover, neither Dob nor the Ohi discloses the features as in the claims 1 and 6. That is, these cited references, even when combined as suggested by the Examiner, do not teach all the features of claims 3~5 and 8~10.

Therefore, the novel features of claims 3~5 and 8~10 are unobvious and patentable over these references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3~5 and 8~10 are allowable over the prior art of record and respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 3~5 and 8~10 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 6 are patentable over the cited references and in condition for allowance. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 3~5 and 8~10 which depend from claims 1 and 6, respectively, are likewise patentable and in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly responded to and overcome. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections and allow all the remaining claims in the application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chao-Chang David Pai/

Date 12/20/2007

Chao-Chang David Pai
Attorney (Reg. No. 51,195)
Pai Patent & Trademark Law Firm
1001 4th Avenue, Suite 3200
Seattle, WA 98154
(Tel) 206-372-3162
(Fax) 206-374-2899